

**REMARKS****Restriction Requirement Dated April 28, 2008**

In the Restriction Requirement dated April 28, 2008, it was maintained that the present application contains claims directed to the following patentability distinct inventions:

Group I: Claims 1-3 and 5-33, “drawn to combined currency denominating and dispensing devices, classified in class 235, subclass 379”;

Group II: Claims 4 and 34-61, “drawn to different currency denominating and dispensing devices, classified in claim 235, subclass 379.”

A. Election

Applicant elects the claims in Group I with traverse.

Applicant traverses the restriction requirement because the distinction between the two Groupings of claims is not understood. The restriction requirement fails to inform the Applicants as to the criteria being used to divide claims and/or the manner in which that criteria are being applied. MPEP 814 states:

The examiner must provide a clear and detailed record of the restriction requirement to provide a clear demarcation between restricted inventions so that it can be determined whether inventions claimed in a continuing application are consonant with the restriction requirement and therefore subject to the prohibition against double patenting rejections under 35 U.S.C. 121. *Geneva Pharms. Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC*, 349 F.3d 1373, 1381, 68 USPQ2d 1865, 1871 (Fed. Cir. 2003).”

Applicant also traverses any characterization of the claims that might narrow their scope. Instead, each claim is limited only by the limitations recited therein. In this regard, Applicant does not follow any alleged “combined” versus “different” distinction recited in the above restriction requirement and maintains that each claim is limited only by the limitations recited in each claim. Reconsideration is respectfully requested along with an indication of allowance or an action on the merits.

Applicant maintains the right to pursue the subject matter of the restricted claims in one or more divisional applications.

In conclusion, the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

No fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required in connection with this amendment (excluding the issue fee), or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4181, Order No. 247171-000306USPT.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/15/08

/Paul R. Kitch/  
Paul R. Kitch  
Reg. No. 38,206  
Nixon Peabody LLP  
161 N. Clark Street  
48<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
312/425-3900  
Attorney for Applicants